

Application Serial No. 10/519,437
Reply to final office action of October 20, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4042

Remarks and Arguments

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-41 are pending in the present application before this amendment. By the present amendment, claims 26 and 35 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the office action (page 3), the examiner objects to the specification because the title of the invention is not descriptive. In response, the applicant has replaced the title with a new title, which now recites: **—SEMICONDUCTOR STORAGE APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR INDICATING INFORMATION IN THE SAME—**. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

The applicant thanks the examiner for conducting a telephonic interview on January 9, 2009 to discuss the faxed proposed amendment to claims 26 and 35 sent January 6, 2009. The examiner stated that no agreement was reached regarding claims 26 and 35 in for overcoming the Hirota reference.

Further, the examiner stated that he would review our arguments for overcoming the Hirota reference only after being submitted in applicant's response to the USPTO. However, the examiner is thanked for taking the time for reviewing the Hirota with the applicant's attorney, where the examiner understood that the present invention's semiconductor storage apparatus is different from a computer system of Hirota. That is, the present invention is able to provide a module **for indicating the indication information stored in the indication information storage region** in the semiconductor storage apparatus without the assistance of a computer system for 1) identify the legitimate holder of the semiconductor storage apparatus before the storage

Application Serial No. 10/519,437
Reply to final office action of October 20, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4042

data content is revealed, 2) to clearly indicate if the data is being read and/or written to the semiconductor storage apparatus, and 3) to eliminate any unknown information in the semiconductor storage apparatus by **having a self-contained rechargeable power source module for independently providing power to the semiconductor storage apparatus** (i.e., not power supplied from the power relating to the computer system shown in Hirota).

Accordingly, the applicant's attorney further explained the unique difference of the present invention from Hirota is that the present invention is able for **present** the information **through** the information indication module of the semiconductor storage apparatus of the present invention that is mainly used for storing information without any assistance from a computer system and **before** the information on the storage device is processed through the computer system for being read off from the computer system's screen. Therefore, the applicant's attorney concluded by stating since the computer system of Hirota does not correspond to the semiconductor storage apparatus of the present invention, the applicant's attorney stated that he believes Hirota does not teach the present invention as Hirota does not disclose or teach the **amended** limitations (specification FIGs. 1 and 7-14). The interview ended with the examiner having a better understanding of the difference of the present invention when compared to the applied reference of Hirota, but the examiner would not commit to any official comment prior to the application being filed with the USPTO.

In the office action (page 4), the examiner rejects claims 26-41 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to distinctly claim the invention. In response, the applicants have amended the claims to address these rejections based on the

Application Serial No. 10/519,437
Reply to final office action of October 20, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4042

examiner's suggestions. More specifically, claim 26 has been amended to eliminate the vagueness that now recites, inter alia: —an information indication module for indicating the indication information stored in the indication information storage region— and claim 35 has been amended to address the examiner's concern that now recites inter alia —controlling the information indication module to indicating the information based on ~~the content of~~ the obtained indication information—. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §112, 2 rejection.

In the office action (page 5), the examiner rejects claims 26-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,606,707 (Hirota et al.).

The applicant has amended independent claims 26 and 35 to clarify the presently claimed invention and to traverse the examiner's rejection.

The present invention provides a method for realizing or providing information indication in a semiconductor storage and an apparatus thereof to overcome the defects in the prior art, such as, lack of identification or authentication of legitimate holder, unclear state of reading and/or writing of the semiconductor storage apparatus, unknown information in the semiconductor storage apparatus. The respective indication of information stored in the indication information storage region of the semiconductor storage apparatus can be realized by using a display component, an acoustic generating component, and/or a vibration component attached in the semiconductor storage apparatus. That is to say, the semiconductor storage apparatus can have the information indication stored in the indication information storage region by itself for **presenting the information through the information indication module for indicating the indication information stored in the indication information storage region.**

Application Serial No. 10/519,437
Reply to final office action of October 20, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4042

Also, the applicant would like to amend the feature of "a power source module providing power to the semiconductor storage apparatus" in claim 1 to "a self-contained rechargeable power source module providing power to the semiconductor storage apparatus independently" to further distinguish the present invention from Hirota.

Claim 26 has been amended to clarify this aspect of the present invention. Claim 26 now recites, inter alia:

--a self-contained rechargeable power source module providing power to the semiconductor storage apparatus independently--
and
--an information indication module for indicating the indication information stored in the indication information storage region, wherein the controller module, the interface module, the semiconductor storage medium module, and the information indication module are electrically connected to each other--.

Support for such amendment can be found in the specification at least at paragraphs 2-4 of page 8 of the present application.

Nowhere in Hirota teaches or discloses at least the information indication module, the self-contained rechargeable power source module, and the controller module for **realizing** the information indication, which are claimed by the limitations of amended claim 26 of the present invention. Also, Hirota cannot achieve the effect of **presenting** the information **through** the information indication module as disclosed in claims 26 and 35.

In contrast, Hirota teaches a computer system having a semiconductor memory card including an authentication memory (332) and a non-authentication memory (331), wherein the authentication memory (332) can be accessed only by external devices

Application Serial No. 10/519,437
Reply to final office action of October 20, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4042

which have been affirmatively authenticated, and the non-authentication memory 331 can be accessed by external devices whether the external devices have been affirmatively authenticated or not. Hirota is aimed to solve a problem that the semiconductor memory cards for protecting copyright of the digital contents cannot be used as auxiliary storage apparatuses in general-purpose computer systems. Accordingly, it can be seen that the purpose of Hirota is to realize a semiconductor memory card for storing the both digital contents to be copyright-protected and other data together, but not to realize a semiconductor memory card for realizing the information indication (see lines 55-62 of column 1 and the summary portion of Hirota). The semiconductor memory card of Hirota does not teach the information indication module, and the controller module (the control IC 302) of Hirota cannot realize the information indication. Although Hirota discloses a power source module Vdd (figure 5), it is supplied from external power sources. Therefore, Hirota does not teach the features of a **self-contained rechargeable** power source module, the controller module, and the information indication module of claim 26. Also, Hirota cannot achieve the effect of **presenting the information through the information indication module having the self-contained rechargeable power source module**, and thus the applicant respectfully submits that the independent claim 26 is in condition for allowance over Hirota.

As to dependent claim 31, nowhere in Hirota teaches or discloses the limitations of claim 31 that recites inter alia: —semiconductor storage apparatus of claim 26, wherein the information indication module comprises at least one of a display component, an acoustic component and a vibration component—, because the display (103, 203) and the speakers (106) are parts of the computer system of Hirota, which

Application Serial No. 10/519,437
Reply to final office action of October 20, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4042

does not correspond to the semiconductor storage apparatus of the present invention.

Thus, for at least this additional reason in regards to claim 31, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 31 is in condition for allowance over Hirota.

As to claims 27-30 and 33-34, the applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable at least since they depend from claim 26, which is now considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons above.

As to claim 32, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 is allowable at least since it depends from dependent claim 31, which is now considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons above. Also, the applicant respectfully submits claim 32 is allowable at least since it depends from independent claim 26, which is now considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons above.

As to independent claim 35, claim 35 recites similar features to those found in claim 26. Therefore, based on the above analysis, Hirota does not teach the features of claim 35, which recites: --after the step of verifying the password, **obtaining** a necessary indication information from the indication information storage region; and controlling the information indication module to indicating the information based on ~~the content of~~ the obtained indication information-- (**emphasis added**). Also, Hirota cannot achieve the effect of **presenting** the information **through** the information indication module, and thus the applicant believes that independent claim 35 should be patentable over Hirota. Therefore, for at least the reasons analogous to those argued above with respect to claim 26 that also applies to claim 35 and the above additional reason, claim 35 should also be patentable over Hirota.

Thus, for at least these above reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that

Application Serial No. 10/519,437
Reply to final office action of October 20, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4042

claim 35 is in condition for allowance over Hirota.

As to claims 36-41, the applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least since they depend from claim 35, which is now considered to be in condition for allowance for the reasons above.

For the reasons set forth above, the applicant respectfully submit that claims 26-41, now pending in this application, are in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and earnestly solicits an indication of allowable subject matter. This amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised in the office action. Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

When issuance of a Notice of Allowance is proper in the next action, the examiner is authorized to cancel the withdrawn claims (if any), for which the applicant reserves the right to file a divisional application. Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 10, 2009

Keith S. Van Duyne
Keith S. Van Duyne, Reg. No. 54,505
Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300